



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,938	04/10/2001	Tomoko Terakado	205602US6DIV	8040
22850	7590	11/20/2002		
OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC FOURTH FLOOR 1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY ARLINGTON, VA 22202			EXAMINER	
			SAJOUS, WESNER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HCG

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/828,938	TERAKADO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Wesner Sajous	2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13,20-29,31 and 33-88 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-13,20-29,31 and 33-88 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

This communication is responsive to the Preliminary amendments filed on 4-10-2001, by which claims 14-19, 30, and 32 are canceled, and claims 1-13, and 20-31 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-13, 20-29, 31, and 33-88 are pending in the application.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

I. Claims 1-13, 20-29, 31, and 33-88 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 33-82 of co-pending application with serial number 09/707, 007, hereinafter the '07 application. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application is somewhat a broader recitation of the claimed invention found in the '07 application. The granting of the current application would infringe with the claimed invention of the '07 application. For instance, the transmitting means, the receiving means and the outputting means recited in claims 1, and 7 of the instant application are found in the recitation of claims 33 and 50 of the '07 application. The omitted elements, i.e., the memory unit and the erasing unit, recited in claim 1 of the instant application is read in claims 39, and 41 of the '07 application, thus providing all the claimed limitations of the instant application to be read in the '07 claimed invention. Hence, it is the Examiner's understanding that the claimed features of the instant invention would not interfere with the functionality of the previously claimed elements in the '07 application and would perform the same functions of—a control device which controls, by transmitting a control to it, an electric apparatus that receives information transmitted via a transmission medium)--. See In re Carlson 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA) 1963. Thus, with respect to the above discussions, it would have been obvious to an artisan skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the teaching of claims 33-82 of the '07 application as a general teaching for a control device that controls and transmits additional information that has been extracted from an electric apparatus to a receiving means for display; in order to perform the same functions as claimed in the present application. The '07 application and claims obviously encompass the claimed invention of the instant application and differ only in terminology and broader steps. The extent that the '07 application's claims

are broaden and therefore generic to instant claimed invention [species], In re Goodman 29 USPQ 2d 2010 CAFC 1993, states that a generic claim cannot be issued without a terminal disclaimer, if a species claim has been previously been claimed in a co-pending application.

II. Claims 1-13, 20-29, 31, and 33-88 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 33-108 of co-pending application with serial number 09/751,113, hereinafter the '13 application. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application is somewhat a broader recitation of the claimed invention found in the '13 application. All the claimed subject matters recited in the present application, for example claim 1, are also recited in the claimed features of the '13 application, and that the granting of the current application would infringe with the claimed invention of the '07 application. For example, the transmitting means, the receiving means, the outputting means, the storing means and the erasing means of the instant application are all recited in claimed invention of the '13 application. The omitted elements in the instant claimed invention would not interfere with the functionality of the previously claimed elements in the '13 application and would thus perform the same functions of—a control device which controls, by transmitting a control to it, an electric apparatus that receives information transmitted via a transmission medium)--. See In re Carlson 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA) 1963. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the teaching of claims 33-108 of the '13 application as a general teaching for a control device that controls and transmits additional information that has been extracted from an electric apparatus to a receiving

means for display; in order to perform the same functions as claimed in the present application. The instant application and claims obviously encompass the claimed invention of the '13 application and differ only in terminology and broader steps. The extent that the '13 application's claims are broaden and therefore generic to the claimed invention of the '13 [species], In re Goodman 29 USPQ 2d 2010 CAFC 1993, states that a generic claim cannot be issued without a terminal disclaimer, if a species claim has been previously been claimed in a co-pending application.

III. Claims 1-13, 20-29, 31, and 33-88 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,441 (hereinafter '41 patent). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application is somewhat a broader recitation of the claimed invention found in the '41. All the claimed subject matters recited in the present application, for example claim 1, are also recited in, for example claim 1 of the '41 application, and that the granting of the current application would in infringe the '41 patent. The extent that the instant application's claims are broaden and therefore generic to the claimed invention of the '41 patent [species], In re Goodman 29 USPQ 2d 2010 CAFC 1993, states that a generic claim cannot be issued without a terminal disclaimer, if a species claim has been previously been claimed in a co-pending application.

IV. Claims 1-13, 20-29, 31, and 33-88 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of the 09/706945 ('45) application. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant application is somewhat a broader recitation of the claimed invention found in the '45 application, and that all the

claimed subject matters recited in the present application, for example claim 1, are also recited in, for example claim 1 of the '45 application, and that the granting of the current application would infringe the claimed invention of the '45 application. See above judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting rejections as applied for the '41 patent, the '13 application, and/or the '07 application for characteristics and reasons of obviousness.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

I. Claims 1-3, 5-17, 20-27, 75-77, 80-81, and 84-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knee et al., Patent No. 6014184.

Considering claim 1, Knee, fig. 1, discloses a control device (31) which controls, by transmitting a control to it, an electric apparatus (27) that receives information transmitted via a transmission medium (software 16), comprising: transmitting unit (31) for transmitting the control signal to the electric apparatus (27); a receiver (31/29) for receiving additional information ... extracted from the received information... by the electric apparatus (*with the additional information being deciphered as the received data feeds and/or the stored program scheduled information [see abstract], or a "on screen reminder" message stored with the EPG [see fig. 36C]*); output unit (23) for outputting

the additional information received by the receiving means to a display device (i.e. the display of device 27); a memory for storing at least portion of said additional information (is equivalently met by either of devices 16-18, and 20; and an erasing unit for deleting said information stored in said memory (*as inherently met by device 31 of fig. 1 in view of figs 36-37 for the remote controller can be provided with a "CLEAR" or a "DELETE" button so as to allow the user erase unwanted information stored in the category storing means. See figs. 36-37.*))

Re claim 2, the claimed "additional information is an EPG that is included in the information received by the electric apparatus" is equivalently met by fig. 6, item 61A.

In claim 3, the claimed "additional information is advertising information EPG that is included in the information received by the electric apparatus" is inherently met by fig. 6, item 63, for the LOGO or MESSAGES may correspond to an advertisement.

Re claim 4, the claimed "selecting unit for selecting ... information received by the receiver, wherein said memory is configured to store the information selected by the selecting unit" is equivalently met by the combined functions of the controller 31 and 16-18, and 20.

As per claim 5, (a) the claimed "second storing unit for storing the additional information..." is met by fig. 1, item 16; (b) the claimed "second selecting unit" is performed by device 31; and (c) the claimed "second transmitting unit..." is performed by device 31 of fig. 1.

In claim 6, the claimed "notifying unit for notifying a user of reception of the additional information when the receiving means receives automatically receives the additional information" is equivalently met by the operation and functions of device 31/27 of fig. 1, for any information transmitted to the receiver via the control device will be outputted for display to the user on the display of the TV monitor, hence enabling the

user to view his programming of interest or the programming corresponding to the created EPG data relating to a current channel reception. See figs. 37-45.

The invention of claim 7 substantially recites the underlying elements as performed by claim 1. As the various elements of claim 1 have been shown to be anticipated by the teachings of Knee, it is readily apparent that the method disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claim 7 are rejected for the same rationale set forth for claim 1.

The invention of claim 8 substantially recites the underlying elements as performed by method claim 7. As the various elements of claim 7 have been shown to be anticipated by the teachings of Knee, it is readily apparent that the method disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claim 8 are rejected by the same rationale set forth for claim 7, for in the Knee's disclosure, a computer program or software incorporated in device 16 is implemented for performing the invention.

The invention of claim 9, including the limitations of: storing a computer program transmitted from the transmission medium...; and performing a control by using the computer program (as met by devices 16-18 and 20-21), substantially recites the underlying elements as performed by method claim 8. As the various elements of claim 8 have been shown to be anticipated by the teachings of Knee, it is readily apparent that the method disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claim 8 are rejected by the same rationale set forth for claim 8, for in the Knee's disclosure, a computer program or software incorporated in device 16 is implemented for performing the invention.

Regarding claim 10, Knee discloses an electric apparatus (27) which receives information that is transmitted via a transmission medium (16) and performs an

operation in accordance with a control signal that is transmitted from a control device (31), comprising a first receiving unit (29) for receiving the control signal transmitted from a control device (31); a controller (16) for performing a control in accordance with the control signal received by the first receiving means; a second receiving unit (27/28) for receiving the information transmitted via the transmission medium; an extracting unit (23) for extracting additional information from the information received by the second receiving means; a transmitting unit (16/23) for transmitting the additional extracted by the extracting means to the control device, wherein the control device (31/16) is configured to store said extracting additional information and the selectively delete said extracted information (*as can be performed using the remote controller to, for example delete or clear the favorites channels or on-screen reminders. See figs. 36c, and 37*). Note that device 31 can also operate as both a transmission medium and a receiving medium when communicating signals to the TV receiver.

The invention of claim 11 recites features equivalent to and performing the same functions as apparatus claim 10 and is similarly rejected.

The invention of claim 12 substantially recites the underlying elements as performed by method claim 11. As the various elements of claim 11 have been shown to be anticipated by the teachings of Knee, it is readily apparent that the method disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claim 12 are rejected by the same rationale set forth for claim 11, for in the Knee's disclosure, a computer program or software incorporated in device 16 is implemented for performing the invention.

The invention of claim 13, including the limitations of: storing the computer program (16-18, 20) transmitted from the transmission medium (31); and controlling the electric apparatus (27) by using the computer program (or software in device 16),

substantially recites the underlying elements as performed by method claim 12. As the various elements of claim 12 have been shown to be anticipated by the teachings of Knee, it is readily apparent that the method disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claim 12 are rejected by the same rationale set forth for claim 12, for in the Knee's disclosure, a computer program or software incorporated in device 16 is implemented for performing the invention.

In claim 20, the claimed "control device instructs the electric apparatus to transmit the additional information" is inherently met by device 31.

In claim 21, the claimed "notifying means for notifying a user of reception of the additional information when the receiving means receives automatically receives the additional information" is equivalently met by the operation and functions of device 31/27 of fig. 1, for any information transmitted to the receiver via the control device will be outputted for display to the user on the display of the TV monitor, hence enabling the user to view his programming of interest or the programming corresponding to the created EPG data relating to a current channel reception. See figs. 37-45.

In claim 22, the claimed "electric apparatus is a personal computer" is inherently met by the disclosure of Knee for his system provides the user with capabilities of ordering products or services from a remote location.

Re claim 23, the claimed "electric apparatus is a television receiver" as met by device 27.

Re claims 24 and 27, the claimed "electric apparatus is a recording apparatus which can performs a recording reservation based on the information transmitted from the control device" is inherently by Knee fig. 1, item 27 for the TV receiver can be a TV/VCR module, as is well known in the art.

As per claim 25, the claimed "output means outputs that part of the additional information which relates to a channel of current reception of the electric apparatus" is inherently met by the disclosure of Knee, fig. 1.

As per claim 26, the claimed "output means outputs that part of the additional information which relates to information that will be received by the electric apparatus from a present time onward" is inherently met by devices 23/27 of fig. 1.

The invention of claim 75 substantially recites the underlying elements as performed by claim 1. As the various elements of claim 1 have been shown to be anticipated by the teachings of Knee, it is readily apparent that the method disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claim 75 are rejected for the same rationale set forth for claim 1.

Claims 76-77 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2 and 3 respectively.

In claim 80, the claimed additional information ... advertisement information is stored in a prescribed area at said storing step" is equivalently met by devices 16—18 or 20 of fig. 1 in Knee.

Claims 81, 84-88, respectively, are rejected for the same reasons as claims 5, 6, and 20-21, and 25-26, respectively.

2. Claims 33-35, 38-39 , 42-49, 52, 55-62, 65-67, 70-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Takahashi (or in view of Nishizawa et al.).

As per claim 33, Knee discloses most claimed features of the invention, including the selecting means (31) for selecting information from the additional information

received by the receiving means (23), but Knee fails to teach an IC card as a detachable storing means for storing information selected by the selecting means (31).

However, Takahashi, in the same field of endeavor, discloses an IC card (item 41 of fig. 8). Note that the IC card 41 provided in Takahashi is a semiconductor memory, and such can be detachably attachable to and from the receiver 5 (as is well known in the art, see patent no. 5805214 assigned to Nishizawa et al.) or to the remote controller 6 for flexible operation, and/or for allowing the user to easily access information communicated to the receiver. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the IC card disclosed in Takahashi together with the control system described in Knee, in order to limit the amount of time it takes a user to retrieve his or her favorite program information stored in the storing means. See (col. 2, lines 5-15).

Re claim 34, the claimed "additional information is an EPG that is included in the information received by the electric apparatus" is equivalently met by fig. 6, item 61A.

In claim 35, the claimed "additional information is advertising information EPG that is included in the information received by the electric apparatus" is inherently met by fig. 6, item 63, for the LOGO or MESSAGES may correspond to an advertisement.

As per claim 38, the claimed "erasing means ..." is inherently met by fig. 1, item 31 in the Knee's disclosure, since the remote controller to, for example, delete or clear the favorites channels or on-screen reminders. See figs. 36c, and 37.

As per claim 39, (a) the claimed "second storing unit for storing the additional information..." is met by fig. 1, item 16; (b) the claimed "second selecting unit" is performed by device 31; and (c) the claimed "second transmitting unit..." is performed by device 31 of fig. 1.

In claim 42, the claimed "notifying unit for notifying a user of reception of the additional information when the receiving means receives automatically receives the additional information" is equivalently met by the operation and functions of device 31/27 of fig. 1, for any information transmitted to the receiver via the control device will be outputted for display to the user on the display of the TV monitor, hence enabling the user to view his programming of interest or the programming corresponding to the created EPG data relating to a current channel reception. See figs. 37-45.

In claim 43, the claimed "control device instructs the electric apparatus to transmit the additional information" is inherently met by device 31.

In claim 44, the claimed "notifying means for notifying a user of reception of the additional information when the receiving means receives automatically receives the additional information" is equivalently met by the operation and functions of device 31/27 of fig. 1, for any information transmitted to the receiver via the control device will be outputted for display to the user on the display of the TV monitor, hence enabling the user to view his programming of interest or the programming corresponding to the created EPG data relating to a current channel reception. See figs. 37-45.

As per claim 45, the claimed "output means outputs that part of the additional information which relates to a channel of current reception of the electric apparatus" is inherently met by the disclosure of Knee, fig. 1.

As per claim 46, the claimed "output means outputs that part of the additional information which relates to information that will be received by the electric apparatus from a present time onward" is inherently met by devices 23/27 of fig. 1.

The invention claim 47 substantially recites the underlying elements as performed by claim 46. As the various elements of claim 46 have been shown to be anticipated by the teachings of Knee, it is readily apparent that the method disclosed by

the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such the limitations recited in claim 47 are rejected for the same rationale set forth for claim 46.

Re claim 48, the claimed “additional information is an EPG that is included in the information received by the electric apparatus” is equivalently met by fig. 6, item 61A of the Knee reference.

In claim 49, the claimed “additional information is advertising information EPG that is included in the information received by the electric apparatus” is inherently met by fig. 6, item 63, for the LOGO or MESSAGES may correspond to an advertisement.

As per claim 52, (a) the claimed “second storing unit for storing the additional information...” is met by fig. 1, item 16; (b) the claimed “second selecting unit” is performed by device 31; and (c) the claimed “second transmitting unit...” is performed by device 31 of fig. 1.

In claim 55, the claimed “notifying unit for notifying a user of reception of the additional information when the receiving means receives automatically receives the additional information” is equivalently met by the operation and functions of device 31/27 of fig. 1, for any information transmitted to the receiver via the control device will be outputted for display to the user on the display of the TV monitor, hence enabling the user to view his programming of interest or the programming corresponding to the created EPG data relating to a current channel reception. See figs. 37-45 of Knee.

In claim 56, the claimed “control device instructs the electric apparatus to transmit the additional information” is inherently met by device 31.

In claim 57, the claimed “notifying means for notifying a user of reception of the additional information when the receiving means receives automatically receives the additional information” is equivalently met by the operation and functions of device 31/27 of fig. 1, for any information transmitted to the receiver via the control device will

be outputted for display to the user on the display of the TV monitor, hence enabling the user to view his programming of interest or the programming corresponding to the created EPG data relating to a current channel reception. See figs. 37-45.

As per claim 58, the claimed "output means outputs that part of the additional information which relates to a channel of current reception of the electric apparatus" is inherently met by the disclosure of Knee, fig. 1.

As per claim 59, the claimed "output means outputs that part of the additional information which relates to information that will be received by the electric apparatus from a present time onward" is inherently met by devices 23/27 of fig. 1.

The invention of claim 60 recites features equivalent to and performing the same functions as claim 47, and is, therefore, subject to rejections for the same reasons and rationale set forth for claim 47.

Claims 61-62, are rejected for reasons similar to claims 48 and 49.

Re claim 65, the claimed "erasing means ..." is obviously met by device 31 in view of device 16 of fig. 1 of the Knee reference in view of Takahashi.

In claim 66, the claimed additional information ... advertisement information is stored in a prescribed area at said storing step" is equivalently met by devices 16—18 or 20 of fig. 1 in Knee.

Claims 67, 70-74 recite features similar to and performing the same functions as in claims 52, 55-59 respectively, and they are similarly rejected.

3. Claims 28-29, 31, 36-37, 41, 50-51, 54, 63-64, 69, 78-79, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Gerszberg et al. (6044403).

Considering 28-29, and 31 Knee discloses most claimed features of the invention but fails to suggest advertisement information including coupon information, and URL information; and an electric apparatus as a personal computer that accesses a server based on information transmitted from a control device.

Nonetheless, Gerszberg, in a similar art, discloses a network server computer platform that is applicable for a plurality of services including Internet, video and application server, and controlling the collection of information from the server (see abstract and col. 3, lines 1-17). The network server computer platform can operate as a home entertainment system suitable and is suitable for providing number of services such as Internet, pay-per-view services, consumer product coupons (or electronic coupons), and advertisements information. See cols. 8-9, lines 28-23. Note that the Internet services may correspond to online services including web sites or URL information, as is well known in conventional art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a system with advertisement information including coupon information, and URL information; and an electric apparatus as a personal computer that accesses a server based on information transmitted from a control device as disclosed in the Gerszberg reference together with the control system described in Knee, so as to provide a system with enhance services that are flexible in usage and profitable to the user.

Claims 36-37, 41 recite features similar to and performing the same functions as in claims 28-29, and 31, respectively, and they are similarly rejected.

Claims 50-51, and 54 recite features similar to and performing the same functions as in claims 28-29, and 31, respectively, and they are similarly rejected.

Claims 63-64, 69 recite features similar to and performing the same functions as in claims 28-29, and 31, respectively, and they are similarly rejected.

Claims 78-79, and 83 recite features similar to and performing the same functions as in claims 28-29, and 31, respectively, and they are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure are as recited in the PTO-892 Form.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Or:

(703) 308-5359 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesner Sajous whose telephone number is (703) 308-5857. The examiner can also be reached on Mondays thru Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached at (703) 308-6829. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-6606.

Wesner Sajous -WS-

14/16/02

Matthew C. Bella
Matthew C. Bella
Primary Examiner